UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,346	12/15/2000	Steven Michael French	AUS9-2000-0457-US1	9186

35525 7590 05/07/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	6

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,346	FRENCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *5*.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendments filed on April 2, 2004.

Specification

1. The examiner apologizes for incorrectly stating that the pages of the disclosure were not numbered and therefore, has withdrawn the corresponding objection.

2. The examiner has also received and considered the amendments to the Specification. The examiner agrees that the Specification now clearly describes that which is illustrated in the drawings, and therefore has withdrawn the corresponding objection to the Specification.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 18, 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (hereinafter Navarre), U.S. Patent 6,442,611, in view of Wang et al. (hereinafter Wang), U.S. Patent 6,119,079 and further in view of Kahn et al. (hereinafter Kahn), U.S. Patent 6,574,628.

3. Regarding claims 1, 18, and 35, Navarre discloses a method in a multi-node networked data processing system for receiving results from remotely executed tasks comprising:

a) receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, (col. 3, lines 46-49);

b) receiving, at a first node, an array of data items (result messages) (col. 4, lines 4-12), sent from a second node;

c) modifying the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise an array of result messages, (col. 3, lines 55-61);

d) sending the results to a requesting client, (col. 3, lines 61-64).

Although the disclosed method of Navarre shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to explicitly disclose:

a) each message having a unique message identifier and associated message text.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where messages are sent to a requesting client, Wang discloses a method for managing result information comprising:

a) messages containing unique message identifiers, (col. 2, lines 54-58);

b) message text content associated with the message identifier, (col. 11, lines 66-67, and col. 12, lines 1-3).

It is well known in the art for messages transmitted in networks to have identifiers associated with them. Given the teachings of Wang, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre, with Wang, in order to have message identifiers associated with the messages received by the gateway 220. The motivation for doing so would have been to use the message identifiers to index catalog files in order to convert result messages of varying locales to the locale of the requesting client before transferring the result message to the requesting client.

Although the combined methods of Navarre and Wang shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

a) using multiple nodes to modify another node's results.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where tasks are remotely executed, Kahn discloses a method comprising:

a) using multiple nodes to modify another node's results, (col. 16, lines 65-67, and col. 17, lines 1-14, also see Fig. 8).

Given the teachings of Kahn, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre

and Wang, to use multiple nodes to modify another node's results. This would have allowed an alternative means for obtaining results from various nodes in a round robin fashion, Kahn, col. 17, lines 21-32.

4. Claims 2, 19, 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre in view of Wang, and further in view of Moharram, U.S. Patent 6,079,036.

5. In considering claims 2, 19, and 36, although the disclosed methods of Navarre in view of Wang shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

a) a result containing both the program result from one or more of the tasks executed, and an array of log messages.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where test messages are propagated through a telecommunications network, Moharram discloses a format for a result message comprising:

a) a result containing both the result of a task executed on a second node and an array of log messages, (col. 13, lines 45-54);

Given the teachings of Moharram, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Wang et al., with Moharram in order to send result messages together with an array of log messages to a requesting client. The motivation for doing

so would have been to provide the client with important administrative information together with the results requested by the client.

6. Claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre in view of Wang, and further in view of Moharram as applied to claims 2, 19, and 36, above, and further in view of Otteson U.S. Patent 5,867,659.

7. In considering claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43, although the disclosed methods of Navarre and Wang, in view of Moharram, shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

a) the log entry comprising a system log, a security log, an application log, or a result error message including a severity field indicating the severity of the error.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where events in a computer system are logged in order for a user to monitor the system, Otteson discloses a method for writing events to a computer system wherein the log entry comprises:

a) an application, security, and system log entry, (col. 4, lines 59-62);

b) a result error message including a severity field indicating a severity of the error, wherein the severity field is an informational field, or the severity field is a warning, (col. 5, lines 52-56).

It is well known in the art to have various logs for monitoring and maintaining systems. Given the teachings of Otteson, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre, and Wang, and Moharram, with Otteson in order to provide a requesting user with important maintenance information about the nodes which are providing a result to the requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent un-authorized users from using the remote applications and systems and to assure that the applications and systems are performing correctly in supplying the result information, and if not so, providing an error message including reasons why not. Therefore, the claimed inventions (claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43) would have been an obvious modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre and Wang, in view of Moharram, and further in view of Otteson.

8. Claims 10-17, 27-34, 44-51, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre and Wang in view of Moharram, and further in view of Kahn.

9. In considering claims, 10, 11, 27, 28, 44, and 45, Navarre in view of Wang shows substantial features of the claimed inventions as mentioned above. Furthermore, Navarre et al. also discloses:

a) sending, from a first node, a command request to a second node (col. 2, lines 1-14).

Although the disclosed methods of Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

a) a result containing both the program result from one or more of the tasks executed and an array of log messages.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where test messages are propagated through a telecommunications network, Moharram discloses a format for a result message comprising:

a) a result containing both the result of a task executed on a second node and an array of log messages, (col. 13, lines 45-54).

Given the teachings of Moharram, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Wang et al., with Moharram in order to send result messages together with an array of log messages to a requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the client with important administrative information together with the results requested by the client.

Although the combined methods of Navarre, Wang, and Moharram further shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they still fail to expressly disclose:

a) producing a modified result at the first node.

Nevertheless, the method of Kahn provides a means for:

a) modifying at the first node, at least one message in a set of messages received in a result to produce a modified result, and appending the modified result to existing results on the first node, the existing results comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node, (col. 17, lines 6-17).

Given the teachings of Kahn, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the combined teachings of Navarre, Wang, and Moharram, to provide the first node with functionality for modifying at least one of the log messages in the set of log messages received in the result to produce a modified result and append the modified result to an existing log system on the first node, the existing log system comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node. This would have provided the client with important administrative information received from remote nodes and aggregated with existing information at the first node, Kahn, col. 8, lines 17-31. This also would have provided an efficient administrative means for keeping track of transactions that take place between the first node and other nodes, Kahn, col. 9, lines 66-67, col. 10, lines 1-55.

10. In considering claims 12-15, 29-32, 46-49, see Navarre et al. col. 3, lines 55-61. The results returned from server applications are merged at the gateway 220, before being returned to the requesting client. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the methods of Navarre et al. with Moharram to provide a means for the merged (modified) result to contain none, some, or all of the log messages contained within the original result. The motivation to do so would be to only forward the log messages needed by the requesting client.

11. In considering claims 16, 33, 50, although the disclosed methods of Navarre et al. in view of Moharram shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

a) translating at least one of the log entries in the set of log entries from a first language into a primary language of the requesting client node if the first language is different from the primary language of the requesting client.

Nevertheless, Wang et al. discloses a method comprising:

a) translating a log file from a first language on a remote system into a primary language on a local system, (col. 5, lines 24-38).

Given the teachings of Wang et al., it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Moharram, with Wang et al. in order to translate log entries into a primary language of the requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the client with a log file that the client can understand. Therefore, the claimed invention (claims 16, 33, and 50) would have been an obvious modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre et al. in view of Moharram, and further in view of Wang et al.

12. In considering claims 17, 34, 51, see Wang et al., col. 2, lines 54-67, and col.3, lines 1-9.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Navarre et al., U.S. Patent 6,442,611 discloses a system and method for remotely executing a request from a client application.

Wang et al., U.S. Patent 6,119,079 discloses a method for translating log messages into a preferred native language.

Moharram, U.S. Patent 6,079,036 discloses a method for transmitting a message with an associated log.

Otteson, U.S. Patent 5,867,659 discloses a method and apparatus for monitoring events in a system.

Kahn et al., U.S. Patent 6,574,628 discloses a system for distributed task execution.

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (703) 305-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

HP/
4/27/04